## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13, 15, 17-21, 23, 24, 26, 28-31, 33, 34, 36, 38-40, 42, 43, 45, 47, and 48 remain in the application with claims 1, 4, 6-9, 11, 15, 17, 21, 24, 26, 28-31, 34, 36, 38-40, 43, 45, 47, and 48 having been amended hereby and claims 16, 27, 37, and 46 having been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14-16, 18, 19, 21, 25-27, 29, 31, 33-36, 37, 39, 40, and 42-46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over *Circello, et al.* in view of *Ryan* and further in view of *Funk, et al.*

An exemplary embodiment of the present invention is shown in FIG. 5 and discussed in the Specification commencing at page 17 in which the application processor is provided with a first bus master controller that communicates over a first common bus to peripherals consisting of a camera display and the like and a second bus master controller that communicates over a second common bus to a shared memory that is connected to a modem.

Such a system provides for quick and easy access to the external application modules including both the shared memory of the modem and the camera and the like.

The claims have been amended hereby to emphasize the above-noted features of this exemplary embodiment, as shown in FIG. 5.

As previously noted, *Circello, et al.* relates to a CPU including a processor and a system bus controller that communicates with a plurality of devices, such as different memory devices, over a system bus.

*Ryan* is cited for showing a shared memory module between a computer and a modem. *Ryan* also discloses that by not clocking the modem computing system and the shared memory during the times when the modem function is not needed, power can be conserved.

*Funk, et al.* is cited for showing a digital signal processor and for relating to a signal modem that can be used to provide a portable wireless data terminal to permit transmission of data to remote locations and display of remote data as well.

It is respectfully submitted that even combining the selected portions of *Circello, et al.* with *Ryan* and *Funk, et al.*, that a system as provided by the present invention involving an application processor that has first bus master controller communicating with external devices over a first common bus and a second bus master controller communicating with a shared memory that is connected to a modem over a second common bus is not disclosed or suggested in such combination of references. Clearly, *Circello, et al.* only provides a single system bus controller to which the system bus is connected.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the specially provided application processor, as in the presently claimed invention, is not rendered obvious by this combination of references.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 8, 17, 28, 38, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over *Circello, et al.* in view of *Ryan* and further in view of *Funk, et al.* and *Watanabe, et al.*

These dependent claims relate to the provision of a strobe signal being sent to the shared memory.

Although *Watanabe, et al.* does relate to the use of a strobe signal, it is respectfully submitted that *Watanabe, et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of the primary reference relating to the provision

- 12 -

of the application processor with the first and second bus master controllers, as recited in the respective independent claims.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over *Circello, et al.* in view of *Ryan* and further in view of *Funk, et al.* and *Fueki.*

Dependent claims 10 and 20 relate to the provision of the protection circuit that protects the shared memory from simultaneously receiving the same address.

Even though *Fueki* relates to an anti-tampering system for an integrated circuit card, it is respectfully submitted that *Fueki* does not cure the deficiency of the primary reference relating to the provision of the application processor with first and second bus master controllers.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over *Circello, et al.* in view of *Ryan* and further in view of *Funk, et al.* and *Wilska, et al.*

Claim 13 depends from independent claim 11 which, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, claim 13 is also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

*Wilska, et al.,* while relating to a system for data communication and the like and includes a memory controller, for example, does not cure the deficiencies of the primary reference.

Accordingly, in view of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that a communication device having a specially constructed application processor, as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited references, alone or in combination.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213
Attorney for Applicants

Dated:  March 18, 2008

*Mailing Address:*
F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY  11797
TEL.:  (516) 692-8888
FAX:  (516) 692-8889